

Minutes of a Regular Meeting Town of Los Altos Hills PLANNING COMMISSION

THURSDAY, May 3, 2007, 7:00 p.m.
Council Chambers, 26379 Fremont Road
cc: Cassettes (3) #5-07

1. ROLL CALL AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at Town Hall.

Present: Chairman Collins, Commissioners Carey, Clow, Cottrell & Harpootlian

Staff: Debbie Pedro, Planning Director; Brian Froelich, Associate Planner; Nicole Horvitz, Assistant Planner; Leslie Hopper, Contract Planner; Victoria Ortland, Planning Secretary

2. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE FLOOR-none

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 3.1 LANDS OF ESHGHI AND DOROODIAN, 13530 Fremont Road; File # 58-07-ZP-SD; A request for a Site Development Permit for a landscape screening plan for a 4,365 square foot new residence approved on March 14, 2005. CEQA review-Categorical Exemption 15304(b) (Staff-Nicole Horvitz).

This item was continued to the June 7, 2007 Planning Commission meeting due to a noticing error.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Clow and seconded by Commissioner Cottrell to allow the applicant to obtain a building permit final for the new residence with an additional \$10,000 landscape code compliance deposit. The public hearing will be scheduled for the June 7, 2007 Planning Commission meeting.

AYES: Chairman Collins, Commissioners Carey, Clow and Harpootlian
NOES: None

- 3.2 LANDS OF ALON, 27673 Lupine Road; File #9-07-ZP-SD-GD; A site development permit for a landscape screening plan for a 7,482 square foot new residence approved on March 17, 2005 and construction of a new 810 square foot swimming pool. CEQA review: Categorical Exemption 15303(e) and 15304(b) (Staff-Brian Froelich).

Commissioner Cottrell recused himself from the discussion due to the proximity of his residence to the project.

Brian Froelich, Associate Planner presented the staff report stating that the application of the landscape screening plan and pool was for a new residence approved by the City Council on an appeal basis in March of 2005. That approval had required immediate landscape screening installation including 20 redwood and 7 oak trees. The applicant exceeded that requirement and had planted 61 redwood, 19 oaks and over 250 perimeter shrubs. The proposed landscape screening plan included 3 redwood trees, 1 palm and additional shrubs. A new pool was proposed southwest of the residence along with a new fence, entry columns and gates. The Town Engineer had required relocation of 2 trees because of the proximity to a storm drainage pipe. An adjacent neighbor had submitted a letter expressing concerns over 7 stone pine trees and the effect on his view in the future. The driveway lighting plan included 9 light fixtures and the Town's lighting policy allowed 2 entry lights in the setback. The lighting policy allowed the Planning Commission the authority to grant more lighting for safety considerations.

Commissioner Harpootlian asked about the potential height of the stone pine trees and the light spread for the driveway light fixtures.

Commissioner Carey asked Brian Froelich for his opinion on the safety issue of the driveway and the need for increased light fixtures.

Brian Froelich replied that some additional lighting is appropriate. Staff recommended a spacing of twenty feet between fixtures, which has been a standard approved in the past, with the proposed fixtures staggered along each side of the driveway.

Zvi Alon, applicant, explained that the original landscaping requirements had been installed and he had received other requests from neighbors to install even more screening than required. He estimated that 90 trees and 300 shrubs had been planted. He had worked to upgrade the road also. Mr. Lee, the neighbor above the Alon property had expressed concern over the eventual height of two of the cedar trees planted. The cedar trees were relocated and replaced with the stone pine trees. The driveway is long and he feels will present a safety issue at night. The number of light fixtures has been reduced from the number that was originally desired. The light is pointed down to light the road.

Commissioner Harpootlian had concerns that the light was baffled instead of louvered and would emit a large spread of light as opposed to a down light appearance. He supported the issue of safety for the driveway.

Chairman Collins asked if the lighting needed was for walking or driving.

Mr. Alon said the lighting need was for walking on the long driveway in the dark.

Ricki Alon, applicant, felt that tremendous effort had been made to accommodate the neighbors and the comments had been positive. Resolution of the issues with the Lees had been attempted and the cedar trees moved and replaced with the stone pines. She assured the Lees and the Commission that immediate action would be taken to trim the trees in the future should a problem with the view develop. She liked the trees very much and respected the quality of the view for the neighbors.

Commissioner Harpootlian asked about the mature height of the stone pine.

Sophia Sella, Landscape Architect for the Alons, explained that in literature the pine tree is mentioned to be 40 to 80 feet tall and have a moderate growth rate. In most cases the height would not exceed 40 feet because of the lack of perfect growing conditions. Photographs taken of other pines in the area show that growth is 40 to 50 feet in height. The pines were chosen because of the frequency of use in Los Altos Hills and contribute to the panoramic view of the area.

Commissioner Carey commented that property ownership may change in the future and the view should be taken more seriously now if there is a concern. Perhaps the trees could be replaced with ones that are known to grow to a maximum of 20 feet.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Jonathan Lee, Lupine Road, acknowledged the Alon's cooperation in moving the cedar trees. He and his wife planned to remain in the home the rest of their lives and felt the view was the most important attribute of the property. The pine trees were in the middle of the prime view from the house. He is not concerned with the trees at the lower level near the street but only the trees affecting his view. He apologized to the Alons for his lack of knowledge regarding the pine trees and the potential mature height. When the cedar trees were replaced he thought the pines were more like a shrub not a tall tree. His landscape architect informed him that the pines could grow tall and dense and eventually totally obscure the house.

Commissioner Harpootlian asked Mr. Lee what he thought could be done to make the entrance to his property more visible.

Mr. Lee understood he was allowed to install a mailbox.

Commissioner Carey asked for clarification on identification options for the Lee's house. Dr. Carey also asked about Mr. Lee's willingness to contribute to the pine tree replacement.

Mr. Lee offered to cover the expenses incurred with the removal and replacement of the pine trees.

John Aldridge, landscape architect for the Lees, asked if the fence and dense hedge along Lupine Road complies with the fence ordinance and if the fence along the driveway is properly located or inside the driveway easement. He felt the potential height and width of the stone pine would affect the view down and across the valley for the Lees.

Pat Splinter, Gigli Court asked why the landscape screening plan had to be reviewed by the Planning Commission. The Alons had at great expense tried to counter the objections of neighbors.

Chairman Collins explained that when there is a conflict during a project a public hearing may be held to find a good solution for all involved.

Commissioner Carey stated that as condition of approval for the new residence the landscape screening was required to be presented before the Planning Commission.

Su Lee, Lupine Road, read from the view ordinance regarding restriction of views. She had safety concerns about the height and density if the hedge growing on either side of the driveway entrance.

Brian Froelich stated that there was no sight distance provision for private driveway access on a right of way. According to the recommended conditions of approval, a letter from a civil engineer is required to confirm that no fences are located within the public right of way and all plantings within the public right of way will have to be relocated prior to final inspection of the house.

Commissioner Carey asked if the height of the planting at the fence could be restricted or if certain types of plants with appropriate height could be required.

Debbie Pedro commented that restriction of plant height is addressed in the view ordinance and in the fence ordinance relating to visibility at an intersection.

Zvi Alon, applicant stated that the original address sign to show the location of the Lee's house was preserved and reinstalled after the improvement to the entrance. The neighbors influenced the type of shrubs selected for the location by the fence. It has been difficult to accommodate the neighbors both above and below the new house. The Lees have planted trees on their own property recently that will reach the height of the pines the Alons have planted.

Chairman Collins asked if it was possible to thin the shrubbery at the fence.

Mr. Alon thought that the neighbors at the road level would not be agreeable to the removal of any of the shrubs.

Chairman Collins asked the reason the pine trees could not be replaced if the Lees paid the total cost.

Ricki Alon read from the view ordinance addressing the desire of the property owners and residents for "beautiful and plentiful landscaping including trees". Regarding the shrubs along Lupine Road, the driveway entrance is immediately at the beginning of Lupine Road and the majority of the shrubs are beyond the driveway.

Commissioner Carey asked the Alons if they would consider entrance columns for the Lee's driveway and asked staff if the Lees were allowed a mailbox column to mark the entrance of the driveway.

Mr. Alon said he would discuss the entrance columns with Mr. Lee outside of the Planning Commission meeting.

Debbie Pedro confirmed that the Lees could be allowed a mailbox column located in the right of way.

Commissioner Clow asked if the pine trees in question were planted as landscape mitigation for other neighbors.

Mr. Alon replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Harpootlian asked if the driveway is the width of the easement, or was it narrower.

Mr. Alon stated that the fence was placed at 25 feet or more, the driveway is about 14 feet wide which was wider than the road that was there originally.

Commissioner Harpootlian clarified that the driveway was 14 feet with additional 5 feet on each side. He asked if there would be planting within the 5 feet on either side.

Mr. Alon replied to the negative and stated there were no plans to plant anything within the easement.

Chairman Carey asked Mr. Lee to comment on the trees recently planted on his property.

Mr. Lee replied that pepper trees had been planted to block the huge flat roof of the Alon's new house. In regard to the location sign at Lupine Road, what is there today is just the mailbox post not a signpost.

Sandy Humphries, Environmental Design Committee, suggested removing two plants between every eight for safety along the fence and a written agreement between the parties to maintain the pine trees at a certain height.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Clow stated the home required screening and was pleased that the applicant had installed much of the landscape already. He felt the stone pine trees served as screening for neighbors looking toward the house and he could support the trees as placed. A written agreement concerning the future trimming of the trees to maintain a certain height to prevent blocking the Lee's view was not needed. The Planning Commission minutes as a public record would reflect the fact that the applicant volunteered to trim the trees should the issue arise in the future. The shrubs along the fence provide screening for the neighboring homes. Columns could emphasize the driveway entrance if the Alons would allow them, but he wondered how the Planning Commission could enforce that. The lighting of the driveway is needed for safety and the limited lighting proposed is appropriate.

Commissioner Carey felt the Alons deserved a lot of credit for the very good job done on screening the property, the nice landscape plan and the accommodations given to the neighbors. He disagreed that the additional driveway lighting was needed but was willing to go along with the other Commissioners in approving the lights if it appeared reasonable. He encouraged the

Alons to work with the Lees and staff to come up with a tasteful solution for an entry or mailbox column for the driveway. He thought a solution for the pine trees should be reached now and with Mr. Lee offering to cover the expense, trees should be planted that grow to 30 feet in height instead of 80 feet tall.

Commissioner Harpootlian thought that an alternative tree should be selected for installation instead of the stone pine trees. Trees should be planted that meet the view ordinance. There are a number of ways the identification of the driveway could be accomplished and the Lees should work with the Planning Department. The lighting selection seemed to function as a spot light and would illuminate the entire area and not just the driveway. The applicant should work with staff to choose a light that fits within the ordinance.

Chairman Collins felt that the stone pines should be replaced with trees that would not grow more than 30 feet in height. A landmark of some type could alleviate the driveway identification problem. She could approve the additional lighting if the type of fixture mentioned by Commissioner Harpootlian was installed.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED BY THE FOLLOWING VOICE VOTE: Motion by Commissioner Carey and seconded by Chairman Collins to approve the requested site development permit for a landscape screening plan and swimming pool subject to the attached conditions of approval in Attachment 1 and add a condition that the seven stone pine trees located at the upper edge of the property be changed to a species that would reach a maximum height of approximately 30 feet.

Commissioner Carey explained the lighting fixtures would need staff approval.

AYES: Chairman Collins, Commissioners Carey and Harpootlian
NOES: Commissioner Clow

Zvi Alon clarified with the Commission that 7 not 6 trees were to be replaced.

Chairman Collins confirmed with Jonathan Lee that he would cover the cost of replacing the trees. Mr. Lee replied in the affirmative.

This decision will be forwarded to be heard at a future City Council meeting.

- 3.3 LANDS OF MALAVALLI, 27500 La Vida Real; File #131-05-ZP-SD-GD; A request to remove two (2) heritage oak trees and replace them with six (6) oak trees; and to keep a 65-ft. tall electric crane on the property during construction. CEQA Review: Categorical Exemption per CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (a). (Staff-Leslie Hopper)

Leslie Hopper, Contract Planner presented the staff report for the project. The neighbors most likely to be affected by the issues proposed live on Foothill Lane northeast of the project and Lucero Lane southwest of the project. Revision of the original grading plan is proposed to reduce the amount of grading. A new retaining wall of 7 feet in height is proposed and required a grading policy exception that staff believed was justified to protect the oak trees on the ridge.

Three arborists have submitted reports that evaluate the trees and all three recommend removal of trees 130 and 132. The Town's arborist also recommended removal of tree 131 because he thought it would be damaged in the process of grading. The grading plan had been revised and it was possible that tree 131 might survive but staff believed it would be wise to authorize removal of 131 if necessary so the applicant would not have to return at a later date. The applicant proposed to replace the trees with 6 sixty-inch box oaks. A tree maintenance bond of \$30,000 to be held for 3 years had been added to the conditions of approval. The application also requested the use and storage of a 64-foot tall tower crane on the property during construction. Commissioner Carey asked if a crane had been requested in the past.

Debbie Pedro replied that only the Evershine project on La Paloma Road had utilized a crane of that size for construction. That crane had been a mobile crane that was used only for a short period of time and then removed.

Joe Grupalo, Project Manager for the applicant, said he was sensitive to the noise and views of the neighbors. He felt that the mobile crane would cause more wear and tear on the roads than the tower crane would because of the number of trips needed to transport it. The diesel motor of the mobile crane would be much louder than the electric motor of the tower crane.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Anne DeGheest, Foothill Lane, presented photos of the oak trees as viewed from her property and neighboring properties. She wanted trees 130 and 132 saved if possible. If it is not possible, then plant 6 replacement trees. Tree 131 should be saved at all cost. The Town should require replacement of any of the 6 new trees should they die in the future. The ridgeline trees 133 through 138 should be preserved and no grading allowed. Anne requested screening of the solar panels that will face her house.

David Bulfer, Lucero Lane, showed the Commissioners photos of the story pole taken from several areas in his home. He understood that there would be noise and activity associated with the construction of the home, but it will end in the evening. The tower crane will be on site continuously for 18 months adversely affecting his view. He felt a mobile crane on the property would be a better solution.

Chairman Collins asked Mr. Bulfer if the access road to the Malavalli property went past his house and if he would hear the noise of the truck transporting the crane.

Mr. Bulfer replied that he would be affected by the noise but would prefer the mobile crane.

Mark Vernon, Foothill Lane, is concerned about the preservation of the remaining oak trees in the conservation easement and likes the changes to the grading plan. It may be impossible to save trees 130 and 132 but he sees no reason to remove tree 131 with the revised grading. He would like all of arborist Barrie Coate's recommendations followed with the exception of removing tree 131. If the tower crane were granted to stay on site, he recommends painting it a dark green color to blend with the foliage.

Kristen Emery, Foothill Lane, said she would like to see the tree 131 preserved, especially if trees 130 and 132 must be removed.

Bob Rowe, Lucero Lane, objected to having the crane on site for a year and a half. He felt that the tower crane would be disruptive 24 hours a day instead of just during working hours. He favored having a mobile crane on the property.

John Harney, Foothill Lane resident since 1965, was unhappy that he had not been noticed because he is more than 500 feet away from the project. His view has already been destroyed by the project as he now looks out at the construction trailer and does not want to see a tower crane also. He presented photos of the changes in his view before and after the project started. He was opposed to the removal of any more trees and missed a large eucalyptus that has been taken down. He would like to be noticed for the Malavalli future landscape screening hearing.

Bill Lanahan, Foothill Lane, showed a photograph of the story pole and the surrounding trees. He thought the entire hillside was beautiful and vibrant and felt it was a shame to remove any of the trees even if diseased as the trees could live on for many years.

Joe Grupalo, Project Manager for the applicant, commented that once the excavation for the pool and basement begins, access needed to put large trees back in the area will be gone. There would be restrictions then on the size of the trees that can be planted. If the trees are replaced before the excavation a crane can be placed up near the hillside. Six of the largest trees available could be planted and an attempt made to return the screening to the original height. If the diseased trees are left in place and die after the house is built, replacement with the largest trees will not be possible. He was willing to find a different solution in regards to the tower crane but a mobile crane is very expensive and to park that type of crane on site when it is not needed every day represents thousands of dollars not being utilized properly.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Cottrell commented that the applicant had demonstrated over and over again his concern for the neighbors, landscaping and trees. He supported the three arborist reports that the particular trees need to be removed and it should be done when trees of substantial size can be planted. Tree 131 will be preserved because of the change in the grading plan and he supported the retaining wall. He felt the applicant should look for alternatives to the tower crane. He is opposed to the large, permanent crane on the property as it disturbs the neighbors and sets a precedent.

Commissioner Harpootlian disclosed that he had met with Ann DeGheest and Mark Vernon. He felt that trees 132 and 130 should be replaced and tree 131 should be preserved. The retaining wall is a great idea. He was willing to defer the decision for the crane to the other Commissioners but felt that the number of trips needed up the winding road by a mobile crane was significant.

Commissioner Carey concurred about the oak tree removal. He supported the use of the 64 foot electric crane because he thought the benefits of the electric crane compared to the diesel mobile crane outweighed the visual impact.

Commissioner Clow felt that trees 130 and 132 should be removed and tree 131 preserved. He could not support the tower crane because of the visual impact to the neighbors.

Chairman Collins could not support the tower crane but recognized the issue was difficult. She felt the time to replace the diseased trees was before the needed excavation for the pool and basement.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED BY THE FOLLOWING VOICE VOTE: Motion by Commissioner Cottrell and seconded by Commissioner Clow to approve the requested tree removal and replacement, subject to the amended conditions of approval in Attachment 1.

AYES: Chairman Collins, Commissioners Carey, Clow, Cottrell and Harpootlian
NOES: None

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED BY THE FOLLOWING VOICE VOTE: Motion by Commissioner Cottrell and seconded by Commissioner Clow to deny the requested use and storage of a 64-foot tall construction crane.

AYES: Chairman Collins, Commissioners Clow, Cottrell and Harpootlian
NOES: Commissioner Carey

This decision will be forwarded to be heard at a future City Council meeting.

- 3.4 LANDS OF ELSON, 14370 Miranda Road; File #63-06-ZP-SD-GD-VAR; A request for a Site Development Permit for a 6,531 sq. ft. new residence and new driveway access. The project includes a 1,321 square foot basement and a 550 square foot detached building (pool house). The applicant requests consideration of a rear setback Variance to legalize an existing pool that is not substantiated by permits of record. CEQA review: Categorical Exemption 15303 (a) and (e) (Staff-Brian Froelich).

Brian Froelich, Associate Planner presented the staff report and stated that the property is located on the east side of Miranda Road where an existing residence and garage will be demolished. The applicant is required to dedicate a 10 foot wide right of way on Miranda Road. The new residence complies with development area standards. The residence was built in 1952 and the recorded permits date to 1961. The existing swimming pool and decking constructed in the setbacks are not substantiated by permits of record. The properties on either side of the Elson property have pools in the back yard one conforming to setbacks and the other built with a variance. Staff could not make findings to recommend a variance.

Bob Elson, applicant, stated that his neighbors were supportive of the project. He noted that solar panels for the pool were permitted and those records exist. No records could be located for the pool itself. He summarized that 3 structures were being removed that are in the setback and the driveway is being updated to meet current guidelines. He asked the Planning Commission to allow the existing pool to remain in place.

Commissioner Carey felt that when a property is developed there is a responsibility to bring the property up to remove non-conforming, non-permitted structures.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Richard Mead, Miranda Road, felt it was heavy handed to require the pool to be removed. The placement of the pool has never caused any problem to him. He knew the previous owner who constructed the house and the pool and found it difficult to believe that the pool was built without a permit. He urged the Planning Commission to allow the project to proceed and not require the removal of the pool.

Sohrab Kianian, Miranda Road, supported the Elson's project and enjoys their pool. He was against removing the pool and felt it had stood the test of time.

Mike Kamangar, Summerhill Avenue, stated that there would be a delay in the project if the removal of the pool was required.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Harpootlian did not support the application because of the setback encroachment and the lack of space between the pool and the neighboring property.

Commissioner Cottrell supported the application and stated that the neither the Town nor the applicant can show that the pool is legal non-conforming or not legal non-conforming.

Commissioner Carey felt the decision was not based upon the neighbor's opinion of the pool or its safety. Planning principles should be followed and the property brought into conformance in regard to the pool for the current and future owners. The property was large and flat enough for a conforming pool to be placed in another location. He saw no positive findings for granting a variance and could not support the project.

Commissioner Clow said that a variance had probably been granted in the past and the records lost. The neighboring property had a similar pool constructed with a variance in the same time period. The neighbors were supportive of the application.

Debbie Pedro, Planning Director, recommended that if the Planning Commission decided to allow the pool to remain, a variance not be granted because the findings are insufficient.

Chairman Collins supported the request and felt the pool was legal non-conforming. It was likely that the Elson property had a permit for a variance, as the neighboring property did.

Debbie Pedro interjected that if the Commission decides that the pool was a legal non-conforming structure and that a permit had been issued. Then, at the time when the property owner wants to rebuild, remodel, or refurbish fifty percent or more of the pool, the project would be returned to the Planning Commission for review.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED BY THE FOLLOWING VOICE VOTE: Motion by Commissioner Cottrell and seconded by Commissioner Clow to approve the application with the finding that the Planning Commission believes that the pool is permitted as legal non-conforming.

AYES: Chairman Collins, Commissioners Clow and Cottrell
NOES: Commissioners Harpootlian and Carey

This decision will be forwarded to be heard at a future City Council meeting.

3.5 LANDS OF MAD MANOR, II, LLC, 27641 Purissima Road; File #22-06-ZP-SD-TM; A request for a six-lot subdivision of an existing 11.899-acre parcel (net). The property is zoned R-A (Residential-Agricultural) and is located at the intersection of Elena Road and Purissima Road. CEQA Review: Mitigated Negative Declaration (Staff-Leslie Hopper). (CONTINUED AT THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST)

4. OLD BUSINESS-none

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 COMMUNITY SURVEY

Planning Director Debbie Pedro presented the results of the Community Survey conducted in April 2007. Survey results indicate that the majority of residents felt the status quo should be maintained regarding site development issues and there continues to be strong support for the Town's open space easement policy. The Commission concurred that a high percentage of residents would like to see increased setback requirements for larger or estate homes and recommends that staff brings back the Estate Home Ordinance for review.

Commissioner Harpootlian felt that new residents would benefit from better understanding of Town policies through a "welcome" packet that would include things such as the video produced for the Town's 50th anniversary and information on development.

Chairman Collins directed staff to create an informational booklet explaining development procedures and processes in Los Altos Hills.

Commissioner Carey suggested that the Community Relations Committee develop the welcome packet.

Sandy Humphries, thought that a pathway map and wildlife map should be included in the welcome packet.

6. REPORT FROM THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING

- 6.1 Planning Commission Representative for April 12th-Cancelled
- 6.2 Planning Commission Representative for April 26th-Commissioner Collins reported that 3.4 of the General Plan update was cut by the City Council
- 6.3 Planning Commission Representative for May 10th-Commissioner Clow
- 6.4 Planning Commission Representative for May 24th-Commissioner Cottrell

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 7.1 Approval of April 5, 2007 minutes

PASSED BY CONSENSUS: To approve the April 5, 2007 minutes as amended.

8. REPORT FROM FAST TRACK MEETING – APRIL 3, APRIL 17 AND APRIL 24, 2007

- 8.1 LANDS OF ARAKAWA, 26889 Nina Place (238-06-ZP-SD-GD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a 4,985 square foot, two-story new residence (maximum height 22') with a 1,226 square foot basement. CEQA review Categorical Exemption 15303(a) - (Staff-Nicole Horvitz).
- 8.2 LANDS OF SUTARDJA, 12869 La Cresta Drive (100-06-ZP-SD-GD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a 4,992 square foot new residence (maximum height 26 feet), a 4,925 square foot basement and a new driveway access. CEQA review-exempt per 15303 (a) (Staff-Brian Froelich).
- 8.3 LANDS OF WOOD, 27133 Byrne Park Lane (199-06-ZP-SD-GD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a new 1,495 square foot pool house addition, new 1,999 square foot pool and patio. CEQA review exempt per 15301(e) and 15303(e) (Staff-Brian Froelich).
- 8.4 LANDS OF ASKARI, 26900 St. Francis Road (217-06-ZP-SD-GD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a new 4,980 square foot two-story residence (maximum height 27 feet). CEQA review-exempt per 15303 (a) (Staff-Brian Froelich).
- 8.5 LANDS OF JONES, 25080 La Loma Drive (34-07-ZP-SD-GD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a new 6,453 square foot two-story residence (maximum height 24 feet). The proposal includes a 3,527 square foot basement and a 1,000 square foot pool in the rear yard. CEQA review-exempt per 15303 (a) (Staff-Brian Froelich).

9. REPORT FROM SITE DEVELOPMENT MEETING – APRIL 10, 2007

- 9.1 LANDS OF PURISSIMA HILLS WATER DISTRICT/TOWN OF LOS ALTOS HILLS, 12863 La Cresta Drive (59-07-ZP-SD); A request for a Site Development Permit to increase the height of an existing 40' tall emergency communications antenna by 22' (total height 62'). CEQA review -15303 (d) (Staff-Nicole Horvitz).

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 10:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Victoria Ortland
Planning Secretary